

SATURDAY, Jan. 18th, 1851.

The Convention, in pursuance of its order, met this day at eleven o'clock.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. GRAUFF.

The roll of the members was called. A quorum being present, the journal of yesterday was read, and a typographical error having, on motion of Mr. WEBER been ordered to be corrected, was approved.

The PRESIDENT said that the regular order of business would be reports of Committees.

There being no reports—

The PRESIDENT announced the unfinished business of the morning hour, to be the amendment to the resolutions of which Mr. RANDALL had heretofore given notice.

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION.

The Convention resumed the consideration of the amendment heretofore offered by Mr. RANDALL, to amend the 17th rule, which is in the following words:

"The previous question shall be always in order in Convention, if seconded by a majority; and, until decided, shall preclude all further amendment and debate, and shall be in this form: 'Shall the main question be now put?' When, on taking the previous question, the Convention shall decide that the same shall not now be put, the main question shall be still under consideration, and if the previous question is sustained, the main question shall be on the adoption of the proposition under consideration. And in cases where there shall be no pending amendments, the question shall be first taken on such amendments in their order, and without further debate or amendment."

Mr. RANDALL had moved to amend this rule as follows:

1. After the word "Convention" in the 1st line, insert the words "the mover designating whether the whole or a part and what part of the matter depending is comprehended in his motion."

2. Strike out all after the word "adoption" in the 8th line, and insert in lieu thereof the following words, "of the special matter under consideration, and the question shall be taken thereon alone without further debate or amendment thereof, and the previous question shall be then exhausted."

Mr. RANDALL remarked, that as some members of the Convention were not probably in their seats when he made an explanation of the operation of this amendment, he would repeat that explanation, so that gentleman might understand the object which he had in view.

Mr. R. explained accordingly.

Some conversation followed between Mr. BISSER and Mr. RANDALL, as to the effect of the amendment.

The question was then taken, and the first and second branches of the amendment were severally adopted.

BUSINESS OF THE CONVENTION.

The Convention proceeded to the considera-

tion of the motion of Mr. SOLLERS, to amend the twenty-third rule which is as follows:

"The preceding rules shall be observed in a Committee of the Whole, so far as they are applicable, except that part of the twentieth rule, which restricts members from speaking more than twice upon the same question. The yeas and noes shall be taken in Committee of the Whole, in the same manner as they are taken in Convention, and a journal of the proceedings in a Committee of the Whole shall be kept. The motion to adjourn and the previous question, shall not be in order in the Committee of the Whole."

Mr. SOLLERS moved to amend the rule, by striking out these words, "except that part of the 20th rule which restricts members from speaking more than twice upon the same question. The yeas and noes shall be taken in Committee of the Whole, in the same manner as they are taken in Convention."

Mr. SOLLERS said that his only motive in proposing the amendment, was to facilitate the business of the Convention. It was well known that there had been occasions in committee of the whole, where gentlemen had spoken four or five times. If this state of things was to continue, the session of the Convention would be protracted a long time. The same motive—to save the consumption of time—had induced him also to offer the other part of the amendment, which proposed to prohibit the taking of the yeas and nays in committee of the whole.

Mr. HARBINE said that he was in favor of the first branch of the amendment, but was opposed to the adoption of the second. He believed that restriction upon debate would to some extent be necessary to prevent the discursive, wild and desultory discussions which took place in committees. As to the latter part of the amendment, he was opposed to its adoption, as he thought it important that the privilege of taking the yeas and nays in Committee, should be allowed. He could see no sufficient reason why they should not be taken in the Committee, as well as in the Convention. The only objection that could be urged was that the yeas and nays might be taken twice on the same proposition; but he submitted whether there were not some propositions voted upon in Committee, which never might be voted upon in the House at all.

Mr. PHELPS was in favor, he said, of the adoption of both the amendments of the gentleman from Calvert, (Mr. SOLLERS.) As Chairman of the Committee on the Rules, he had dissented from the proposition to take the yeas and nays in Committee. He regarded the taking of the yeas and nays there, as a work of supererogation, because they could as well be taken in Convention.

Mr. SPENCER asked for information. He did not understand that every measure offered in committee of the whole would come up again in Convention.

Mr. PHELPS. I mean to say, that it is competent for a gentleman to offer the same proposition in Convention, which may have been voted down in Committee.

Mr. SPENCER. But a great deal of time will be unnecessarily consumed in that way. I hear